

Minutes

Meeting Title: St Ives Town Deal Board

Date: 20th October 2020

Time: 17:00 to 19:00

Location: Microsoft Teams

Chaired by: Sarah Stevens

Attendees: Members: Andrew Baragwaneth (AB), Libby Buckley (LB), Steve Cross (SC – left at 17:23), Neil Davis (ND), Tony Harris (TH), Gareth Jones (GJ), Vanessa Luckwell (VL), Ian McChesney (IM), Andrew Mitchell (AM), Poppy Naylor (PN), Sarah Stevens (SS), Linda Taylor CC (LT), Derek Thomas MP (DT)
Officers: Beth Briggs (BB), Imogen Day (ID), Lucy Davis (LD), Emily Kent (EK), Phill Woods (PW).

1. Apologies: James Butterworth (JB), Rowena Swallow (RS)

Minutes

Action

2 Minutes of Last Meeting

Minutes of Board Meeting held on 6th October 2020:

- These minutes were agreed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

Minutes of Extraordinary Board Meeting held on 7th October 2020:

- ND noted that the bullet point within discussion under item 4(11) should also be included under item 4(10) to reflect discussion around possible inclusion of this project under a delegated fund.
- These minutes were agreed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

3 Declarations of Interest

- None declared.

4 Vision and Objectives Update

- LD shared her screen containing the draft document.

- ND advised that the group had sought to reduce the words and simplify the statement.
- It was noted that the next step was to ensure robust outcome indicators against the three identified objectives.
- LD noted that the TIP required a strong narrative and also needed to interweave with the Theory of Change.
- SS noted that connectivity was not mentioned specifically, although it was noted that this could be covered under enterprise.
- This Vision and Objectives document was approved by the Board, noting that there may be amendments required as the TIP and projects developed.

5 Project Prioritisation

- GJ advised that the panel, consisting of GJ, ND, IM, GT and SS, had met the previous day, having each scored the projects against a set of 20 questions.
- GJ shared the summary spreadsheet detailing the average scores.
- Clarification on co/match funding requirements was sought, with LD advising that the requirement for pound-for-pound co-funding had been removed but that it was important to demonstrate that funding had been sought and reasons given as to why funding was unavailable.
- LD confirmed that Arup was able to assist in terms of identifying possible funding streams, but that a project shortlist was key to this in order to identify the appropriate funds.
- It was noted that the total sum of the current shortlist would allow for a contingency should costs increase, and also for consideration of a delegated fund which would be discussed in more detail under item 6 on the agenda.
- ND raised the question of how contingency should be managed and whether there was allowance for costs to change during business case development.
- **ACTION:** PW to raise with Gov advisors and seek advice based on Cohort 1 feedback.
- PW updated the Board regarding feedback received from Arup on Cohort 1 submissions. He noted that the golden thread of the TIP was key and that the fund was up to £25m but did not have to reach this threshold, with strategic fit being more important.
- The likely success of the TIP was higher with a cohesive set of projects with a strong supporting narrative and that, should this not hit the £25m total, it was not advisable to 'shoehorn' additional projects in to hit the £25m.

PW

- LD noted that a number of the shortlisted projects were being examined with the potential of turning them into one proposal, a meeting with proposers was being held the following week.
- PW noted that this idea of packaging projects into themes was good as it offered cohesion to the proposals.
- EK felt that the number of projects on the shortlist was still high and some were small, and would require bringing together. She noted that the community focus and importance were clear and commended the Board on this. Her concern was around whether the list would be perceived by the Government as transformational.
- EK advised that the Board must be clear on the set of projects covering the deliverables within the guidance, and the outputs and outcomes the Government wants to see as a set of investments.
- It was noted that some of the smaller projects might fit best in the proposed delegated fund, with the TIP focussing on a set of larger, more strategic projects.
- EK referred Members to the Towns guidance, page 41, Annex A: Intervention Framework. She recommended mapping the projects against this framework in order to review the balance of the projects against the themes.
- DT noted that he was following up on the Train Station project.
- DT also noted that he was chasing on the Bay to Bay project but had not yet been able to bottom this out. EK noted that she would follow up on this with Cornwall Council colleagues.
- **ACTION:** EK to follow up on Bay to Bay.
- PW encouraged Board members to review published TIPs from Cohort 1 and shared links for Members to refer to.
- LD noted that there was significant analysis work required on the projects in order to develop the TIP and that this relied on the shortlist being decided.
- EK recommended LD undertake mapping work, and feed back how this flows through from vision to project deliverables. The Board would then need to identify any gaps and/or projects that do not strategically fit and therefore should not be included in the TIP.
- LD shared a draft infographic which visually depicted the spread of the projects within the town and how they fitted against a population map. This was a work in progress and would be updated as projects were agreed for inclusion.
- LD noted that projects group were aware this was an iterative process and the list they had produced was a first draft, but reminded Members that identifying the shortlist was increasingly urgent in order to produce the draft TIP.

EK

6 Delegated Fund

- LT reported that the current thinking was to allocated £1-1.5m to this fund which would be used to support small businesses.
- LT had made progress with investigating options, including an initial discussion with the Town Council about the possibility of them undertaking this scheme.
- EK advised that when considering this type of project, track record of any delivery partner was key as the TIP would need to demonstrate ability to manage a robust grants programme and consideration of the complexities of such a scheme.
- EK advised that the Board should look to commission any potential delivery body to identify how they would deliver against the vision and scope of the fund and how they would report back to the Board.
- **ACTION:** LT and EK to discuss in more detail prior to next Board meeting.

LT / EK

7 Budget update

- LD shared an updated budget summary.
- It was noted that there was a timesheeting error that would be removed from future updates.
- LD reported that there was an overall spend of £30k required for feasibility studies required on key strategic sites to progress projects for TIP inclusion.
- The Board considered it imperative that LD be able to carry out these works as and when required.
- It was agreed by the Board that LD be given delegated authority to spend up to £30k on feasibility studies in order to ready projects for TIP inclusion.

8 AOB

- PW shared a timeline which took the Board through to TIP submission in January.
- PW advised that a draft TIP would be required by early November, with a check and challenge session by Arup being provided in late November, before further drafting and internal sign off processes throughout December and January.

9 Date and time of next meeting

- 5pm on 3rd November.
- It was noted that the projects prioritisation group would be meeting again before the next Board meeting.